

After 5 years, small businesses get nothing.

Now, there is another element to this issue, and that is called State aid. What is happening here is the Federal Government is just passing along tax increases to the States. They say "we are cutting your taxes." But what happens when the States do not have enough money, as is the case now? They cut Medicaid, they cut child care subsidies, they cut education. So that means what, either you lose programs at the State level, or you get a tax increase at the State level, while the Republicans tell you we are giving a tax cut to the very wealthy at the Federal level.

We Democrats believe that if we want to stimulate this economy we do a couple of things. We give money directly to the American working class. Second, we give money to the States so they can hire people, build roads, improve our infrastructure. That is how you create jobs.

There is a consensus among economists that this tax plan will not work. I think this dog will not hunt. I think we need to reject the Republican proposal this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUPPORT THE JOBS AND GROWTH TAX ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 2, the President's Jobs and Growth Tax Act of 2003. There is no need for further debate on this bill: America needs economic stimulus, and it needs it now. Congress cannot stand on the sidelines while too many of our fellow citizens cannot find work or are on the verge of being laid off. That is why I support the Jobs and Growth Tax Act of 2003.

This important legislation will help expand business investment by eliminating the double tax on corporate income. This plan encourages investments that help small businesses grow. I believe more tax relief means more jobs.

Small businesses are becoming more and more important to the Nation's overall business activity. They create the majority of new jobs and account

for half the economy's private output. For this reason, this package gives small businesses the ability to immediately expense up to \$75,000 instead of the current write-off of \$25,000 for capital purchases. This encourages small businesses to buy technology, machinery and other equipment that they need to expand and meet the needs of their consumers.

The Flower Mound Chamber in my district expressed their support of the provision since they have over 725 companies that will be able to benefit. These small businesses in my district will receive a tax cut of at least \$2,000 each, money that can be used to hire additional workers, boost current workers' pay or reinvest in their company. Any amount of money that a small business can save today will result in business growth and development in the years to come.

The Jobs and Growth Tax Act will create at least 1 million jobs by the end of 2004, according to the Heritage Foundation.

With the increase in the child tax credit and elimination of the marriage penalty, with those savings an additional 300,000 jobs will be created.

Over the recent district work period, I conducted 10 town hall meetings in my district. At almost every event constituents asked about the economy and asked about tax cuts for stimulus. Many out-of-work or underemployed people begged for relief soon. We cannot let these Americans down.

Also, May marks the month hundreds of students will graduate from local colleges and universities and from the two universities in my district. These young people, having completed their education, will enter the job market eager to contribute. We owe it to future generations to stimulate our economy now to ensure that jobs are available in the future.

ISSUES AFFECTING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am certainly proud to be here this afternoon, and wanted to talk some about the issues that we are facing here in Washington.

I am proud to say that while the national news has really focused, and rightfully so, on the war in Iraq, the House has not only supported our military efforts, but we have been working on a very good, pro-growth, pro-jobs domestic agenda. We have a good jobs package that will be voted on this week, we have passed a good energy bill, we have passed a good education bill, and we will be working on a Medicare reform bill very soon. So I am optimistic about the things that the House has been doing.

We hear a lot of partisan politics and a lot of bashing. I guess one of the

things that is frustrating to me is that while we hear people, as one of the previous speakers was talking about tax breaks for the wealthy, and that just seems to be the Democrat buzz phrase for hatred and division in society, what I have been curious about is tear down somebody else's policy or plan, if you want to, but offer your own.

It is always curious, we do not hear too many alternatives from the other party. I say, look, hey, this floor is the great hall of debate. Whether you are liberal or conservative, urban or rural, bring your ideas to the floor. Offer your ideas in the form of amendments. Offer your ideas in the form of legislation, and let us see what we can do. Bring the best of the Democrats, the best of the Republicans, together to do what is best for America.

It is always disappointing when you hear people just attack legislation when it is clear they have not even read the bill. Yet on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, you cannot take the politics out of politics, so what the heck, let us just move on with it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk a little bit about the war in Iraq. I have to continuously brag about the 3rd Infantry Division in Hinesville, Georgia, Fort Stewart. I am wearing their patch on my lapel, which was given to me by the wives organizations down there. I am very proud of what they did. We followed them up the Euphrates River as they marched on to Baghdad.

□ 1615

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say that I have had more constituents in the last month sleep in Saddam Hussein's palace than I have who have eaten in French restaurants. That is probably going to continue to be the case as the months and weeks pass by.

But in terms of the mission in Iraq, liberating Iraq, one of the things that we have had in Congress is many former Iraqi citizens who have come to seek refuge in the United States of America, many women. And these are women whose fathers or brothers were abducted, sisters and cousins, and for very small offenses, such as starting peace movements or protesting this or that. And they lived under the oppression of Saddam Hussein's regime. And it was a common practice that if he had a critic he would take their wife or their daughter and videotape sexual abuses of them and show it back to the male members of the family and say, get in line, get behind our program, or we will continue it. What a harsh way to deal with enemies.

We are, of course, finding mass graves. Amnesty International, which is not exactly a pro-American organization, estimated that there are anywhere between 70,000 and 150,000 Iraqis who have disappeared, unaccounted for, the highest number of any nation in the world. And now we are seeing these mass graves and trying to identify the loved ones of the Iraqi people.

But all of these folks have told us over and over again, we need an outside

force to liberate us; we cannot do it from within. That liberation has come. From the left we heard all kinds of criticism during the war: well, the war is just going to be a blood bath, thousands and thousands of people on both sides will be killed. Yet, this was one of the first, probably the first war in history where the regime was removed with as little damage as possible to the citizens. And that is very important, because ordinarily we go in and we wipe out a country as a way of removing the regime. In this case, historically, we were able to remove the regime with almost a surgical removal rather than just blowing up everything and everybody.

Now, there was collateral damage, but very minimal compared to other wars in the past. The people there, again, have responded very, very positively; and the liberation has begun. But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we cannot just add water and have a democracy overnight. Many people now on the left are saying, well, it is going to be a long time. Well, there are nations in this world who do not want us to succeed. Unfortunately, many of them are democratic nations themselves who seem to be a constant thorn, a constant critic. But we want democracy, frankly, in all of the Middle Eastern countries, personally speaking. But I think it is very important to try to achieve that right now in Iraq, and we are moving in that direction. Who should rebuild it? Well, the U.N. again, not exactly a good catalyst for peace in Iraq, an organization that has spent a lot of time criticizing America.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my colleagues have heard, but last Friday at the U.N., the food workers union went on strike; and they went on strike and closed down the cafeteria during Friday at lunch, and so some supervisor at the U.N. said, well, we are going to open up the cafeteria. Guess what happened? All of these high and mighty U.N. people decided to have a run on the cafeteria. They looted the food, they looted the wine, they even stole the silverware, and the damages and the food loss is anywhere from \$7,000 to \$9,000. These are supposed to be the people who have been criticizing America. That was reported by the Washington Times. So much for U.N. foolishness. It is probably in line with everything else.

But if we would look at what the U.N. has done for Kosovo, we have been out of it; and officially there has been peace there since March 23, 4 years ago. Well, pre-war Kosovo used to export electricity. Now they have to have every 4 hours a mandatory blackout, rolling blackouts where they have to turn off all of their electricity for 2 hours. That is Kosovo under U.N. rebuilding. Elections, supposed to be free elections; and yet under the U.N. mandate, one has to have 30 percent of the candidates be women. Now, maybe it should be 100 percent. Maybe it is some

other formula. But in a free country, you let the people, the electorate decide; you do not have some U.N. bureaucrat sitting in New York mandating the quota for Kosovo.

Also in Kosovo under the U.N., interpreters are paid \$300 and \$400 and \$500 a week, whereas former business people are paid \$100 a week. The economy has not turned around at all. One of the reasons is the U.N. is not supporting the concept of private property and private investment and insurance and things that are fundamental to investment in an economy. The U.N. has not done a good job of that. So I think the U.N.'s role in terms of Iraq, they should be there for humanitarian assistance, should be there to complement the U.S. efforts; but I do not think they are any kind of organization that can lead.

I frankly believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that the U.S. Congress has some hearings on the U.N. We pick up 25 percent of their tab. And yet, if you ask the people of America should we still be involved in it, I do not think they would pass muster, if we threw it out to the American electorate. I do not want to throw the U.N. out, and I do not want to give up on them yet; but I do think they are in dire, dire need of some reforms.

We are going to be talking about our jobs bill and we have been joined by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), and he has been a very hardworking freshman Member of this body who has worked to help create jobs in south Florida as well as the rest of the country. I would certainly be honored to yield any time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), if he wants to talk about Iraq or the jobs bill or whatever else is on his mind.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia. Before I say anything else, I think it is important to once again commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON). I recall his words before the war talking about the importance of liberating the people of Iraq and how frustrated I think many in this country and the gentleman was by the reaction of some of the extreme left that was really just denigrating really the Iraqi people, saying that they could not be free, saying that they did not want to be free, saying that they were not going to welcome the liberating troops. And the gentleman was very clear then, and he continues to be very clear; and I want to thank him for that. It is amazing how common sense does prevail.

The gentleman was just mentioning that now that the left has to admit that the people of Iraq deserve to be free, wanted to be free, deserve to be free, now they are saying, well, democracy is going to be very difficult. I can tell my colleagues one thing: it is not going to be as difficult as it would have been if Saddam Hussein were still there. So I think it is once again the

brave men and women of the United States Armed Forces, who put their lives on the line, once again, to protect our freedoms, to protect our liberties, and to liberate a people who have been suffering for a generation, who deserve our thanks and our praise.

I think our President deserves our thanks and our praise for his leadership, for the way that he has shown steadfast leadership. I think we all must admire his convictions and his love for freedom. And I think the Iraqi people as well as the American people are so much better off, because we have gotten rid of, through our armed services, those brave young men and women and the leadership of our President have gotten rid of a dictator who was a threat not only to the Iraqi people and to the region, but clearly a grave threat to the American people.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is we hear from some people, well, we should not interfere in Iraq. It is like oh, yes, these people deserve to be oppressed and put down, and they do not deserve freedom; and now that they have been liberated, we are hearing the same people saying, well, democracy will not work, as if they are intellectually challenged, that they cannot handle it. I wish these people would just for one time turn their wrath on France, just for the day, just for the day and say, maybe France should not have issued a passport to Saddam Hussein and his family. Gee whiz, boys, that was bad. Or, gee whiz, garçon, I guess I should say. But it is amazing. They are not going to quit and they cannot stand the fact that the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, was right. They cannot stand that.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, not only can they not stand that, but they also want to blame the United States for all of the ills. I keep hearing that the United States is to blame for everything. The bad people in Iraq were the brave men and women who were there to liberate the Iraqi people. Now, it is pretty obvious when we see the Iraqi people's reaction, tearing down the statues, crying when they see these unmarked graves where their relatives were thrown in, probably taken in the middle of the night by the Iraqi regime, it is pretty obvious who the bad people were. It is pretty obvious who the good guy is and has always been, and that is the American people, the American GIs and men and women who liberated France once, twice; and yet the French seem to believe that it is okay for the U.S. to sacrifice blood to liberate France twice, but it is not okay for anybody else to be liberated. It seems that only they have the God-given right to be free.

Well, I say to my colleagues, that is an attitude that I do not share, it is an attitude that the American people do not share, it is clearly not an attitude and thank God that the American President, our President does not

share. Freedom is not something that we can just throw away so easily; it is something that is given by God. And every once in a while, because of the sacrifice, the patriotism, the love of freedom of our men and women in uniform who are all volunteers, sometimes some tough sacrifices are made to make sure that our interests, our people's interests, our freedoms are protected and also at the same time that we can liberate people who have suffered so much.

The gentleman was just mentioning the atrocities committed on women by Saddam Hussein's regime, the atrocities committed on children, on everybody. And thank God and thank our Armed Forces and our President that that nightmare is over. There are some grave challenges ahead, because democracy is not easy.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, last week I went to a memorial service for the 34 soldiers from the third I.D. at Fort Stewart basically for their loved ones, but the 34 soldiers who died. It was interesting as I talked to the wives and the mothers and the children of these soldiers that none of them were saying, well, he died in vain. It was not that. It was, now we have to continue working for Iraqi freedom and for Iraq's future and do everything we can. Otherwise, he would have died in vain. It was a very touching ceremony, because the patriotism of the families of these fallen soldiers did not flinch one bit. It was unwavering. Very, very courageous statement, just being there and sitting in the stands during the service; and there are 34 sets of boots with the rifle and the helmet and the dog tags jangling in the wind and yet, at the same time, sadness and a great promise of tomorrow juxtaposed. I believe that we have an obligation for those soldiers to continue and do these things.

The audacity of countries like France. Now there is a French company that actually serves the United States Marines. It is a multimillion dollar contract that they have, I think \$81 million, just a tremendous amount of money, a French company serving the United States Marines. We are going to continue to work on the Department of Defense to give favoritism to American companies, or allied companies, or coalition companies, and not countries like the French. I mean, can we imagine that while these soldiers were dying and the Marine Corps was counting their casualties, the French companies, on the backs of the American Marines, were counting their profits? It is sickening for me to think about in terms of the French dealing with Iraq behind the scenes, the French issuing passports. Unfortunately, we have a lot of Democrat Members of Congress who are real proud of this and look to France for leadership. I just think it is absolutely inexcusable.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Well, if the gentleman will yield, I have a hard time understanding in par-

ticular how a country like France who has twice had to first suffer the humiliation of being taken over and then had to wait for the American GIs to liberate them. How, out of anybody in the world, how France, how France could have taken up the attitude that they did. Look, they have the right to do what they want, they are free, they are a democratic government; but I think it is important that we recognize and we realize what that attitude was. Americans, bright, vibrant, with a lifetime to live, Americans gave their lives, gave their lives to liberate the people of Iraq.

□ 1630

And the French know it is not that they were praising them, which is what they should have been doing, they were criticizing them. They were again doing everything in their power to make it not succeed to the point of giving passports to the leaders of that regime. I have a hard time believing that. Out of everybody in this entire world, if there is one group of people that should have understood the beauty of freedom, how frail it is and how sometimes you need some help from outside, it is the French, it is the French. And I will never forget the writing, the graffiti on that grave of British soldiers on French soil, British soldiers that died also liberating France in World War II. The writing of graffiti on this grave that basically said take this trash, trash, these are people who died to liberate a different country, off our soil because it is polluting our soil.

It is a very sad, sad, sad day for the entire world when people just disregard the truth, disregard reality, have no semblance of gratitude, of respect, and who, I guess, believe that they are the only ones that deserve others to die for their freedom and then they criticize those that died for their freedom. That is frankly for me very hard to stomach. I am optimistic, I am hopeful that they will realize how wrong they were. But still those that painted that graffiti, those have no forgiveness in my heart.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is sad when you think France was the country home to the great Lafayette who fought so hard for American freedom and whose portrait hangs on the floor of this Chamber. And yet look at the modern Frenchmen. Boy, have they strayed from the love of freedom. To them security and safety is paramount among anything. And, unfortunately, you do not see France really being a world leader anymore. You see France being a world critic. But there are a lot of French companies that are doing business in America who are suffering, and there are a lot more who are going to hear a lot more in the future, because I think before the Department of Defense issues any more contracts to French companies it will have to go through a lot of congressional scrutiny.

Let me ask you this: In terms of the economy right now, one of the things

we want to do is create a lot of jobs as possible. And I am glad that in the House we have been working on a good domestic agenda and we have got a good jobs package that is coming up. And I am going to be supporting that. It has a lot of different elements in it to give growth to our economy, but there is a child tax credit, increasing the child tax credit to a thousand dollars.

Now, the gentleman is single, but I have four children and I can tell you that really means a lot to the families of this country. Children are very, very expensive. You have to buy washers and dryers. You buy tennis shoes. They lose tennis shoes. You buy a book bag. They wear it out. You cannot buy a sedan any more. You have to buy a station wagon or a Suburban. You have to have the extra seatbelts to drive carpool with. If the kid wants to take tuba lessons and, God bless him, tubas are very expensive, you have to pay for the tuba rental and somebody to teach them. You have to buy the school band uniforms and the cheerleading uniforms. A thousand dollar tax credit is actually very, very modest. And if it had been indexed to inflation, it would be worth probably 2 or \$3,000 very easily from the time we put in the \$500 tax credit. But a thousand, making it immediate this year, I think is a step in the right direction.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. The gentleman just mentioned part of this plan is to create jobs, which is what we are talking about here. The gentleman just mentioned a big part of it and that is the thing that our friends on the Democratic side say is reckless. It is reckless to give that tax credit. It is reckless to cut the marriage tax.

You are taxing people because they are married. What is that all about? It is hard to believe. And yet when we here in the House are focused on trying to create jobs and we are focused on trying to get some tax relief to families, get rid of some of those just incredible taxes, they say that we are reckless. Reckless because you want to give a tax break for the children that a family has? Is that reckless? By the way, what is a tax break? It is not a gift. All we are saying is we are going to allow those families to keep a little bit more of their money and not bring it up here. That is reckless?

Mr. KINGSTON. I am glad you mentioned that. We had a speaker previously today who was talking about a Democrat proposal. He kept saying, We give this, we give this. Well, you do not give anything. You take it away and then you redistribute it. That is all it is, redistribution of wealth. It is not our money to give. We just want to take less of it. And I think the folks back home, the families raising children, know how to spend this thousand dollars a heck of a lot better than any brilliance we have on any committee in Washington.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I think that is a big part of the

problem here, a big part of the philosophical difference between the two sides. The other side, and they have the belief that every dollar the government has is government's money, that it is government's right to have that money, that that is where it belongs.

We believe, which what I think is pretty obvious, that is not government's money. Government takes it from the people, by the way, forcefully takes it from the people. The people do not have a choice. They have to send it up here; otherwise the IRS will be knocking on their door soon. So, no, it is not government's money. It is the people's money.

So they claim we are reckless because we want government to take a little bit less of their money so they can reinvest it in their children? So they do not get taxed, we take less money, and the government takes more when they get married? No. No. It is not government's money. If the issue is, well, the government does not have enough money, hey, we all understand that we have to do what we have to do. But when you look at the fraud and the waste that exists within our government, and I have been doing a little bit of work on that and doing some research, it does not take long, you do not have to scratch real deep to see where some of the money is just thrown away, bucket loads of money is thrown away.

If you ask the American people is the government, is their government, the U.S. Federal Government, is it totally efficient? Do we not waste any money? Of course we waste money. The American people know that and they do not have the ability to see what we get to see on a daily basis where the money is wasted.

So for anybody to say that, no, we cannot let the people keep a little bit more of their money and we are going to take it because they got married, we are going to take it and not allow them to spend it on their kids because it is the government's money, I think that is what is reckless. That is what is irresponsible, particularly in a time like this, and that is why I have to commend one more time our President.

Our President has had a lot on his mind, a lot on his plate, and yet he has maintained a strong focus on the war on terrorism. He said what he was going to do, and I know a lot of people are not used to this, he said what he was going to do and he has done what he said. But he has also maintained his focus on making sure we can provide jobs for the American people.

Some I guess are happy with the status quo. The President and this House, the majority in this House are not content with the status quo. People need to be able to find jobs, high paying jobs, productive jobs. The plan this House has passed and we continue to work on provides jobs. And those that want to criticize his plan are basically saying we think the situation is fine. Everybody is okay. What we need to do

is just take more money. No, we need to take less money, provide more jobs, and leave more money in their pockets.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is amazing. One of the other common sense solutions we are doing to create jobs is ending the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. It does not affect me.

Mr. KINGSTON. One day you will be lucky enough to join the ranks of all of us who are married. And when that happens, you and your wife will start, well, let us say right now you are in the 20 percent tax bracket and she is in the 20 percent tax bracket, but when you get married and your income becomes one, suddenly you will be in the 25 percent tax bracket. And the only thing that happened is you walked down the aisle together and made an oath, and that is not right. It penalizes people from getting married. It encourages people to live together. It does not make sense. We are trying to end the marriage tax penalty.

Another thing we are proposing to do in order to create jobs is to reduce the tax rates. Rates going from 28 to 25 percent, from 31 to 28 percent, from 36 to 33 percent and 39.6 to 35 percent. Again, it is common sense. And the interesting thing is that Democrats have already voted this on a bipartisan basis. All we are saying is let us accelerate this because the economy needs help now. And, unfortunately, sometimes you wonder in this town because everything else under the sun seems to happen, you wonder if people would rather have the economy stay in the tank so that their political party is benefited. And I think that is a sick thing to do if you are playing with people's jobs and people's future just so your party can do well.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. One of the things that strikes me is what you just said. They have already voted for a lot of these proposals. They were in favor of these proposals. And now all of the sudden they say that those same proposals that they voted for are reckless. Again, we have to repeat what they are, the marriage tax. They say that is reckless, again, even though many of them already voted for it. That is why you have to ask the question or pose the question that you just posed to us. Why all the sudden? And they will give you different excuses at different times.

Well, when the economy is not doing well this is not the time to lower taxes. Excuse me? When the economy is not doing well is not the time to incentivize the economy? If this is not the time, when is the time? Clearly we need to incentivize the economy. I think that what happens also is up here in D.C. we sometimes forget reality. We are okay up here. We are able to discuss these things on a theoretical level. But for those hard working American families who are paying those taxes, some of them may have lost a job or fear that they are losing their job. This is not theory. This is

not something you can just talk about. They are desperately looking at ways we can get this economy going. They need this economy to do better. They need their taxes to be cut so they can keep a little bit more of their money. This is not theory. This is practice. This is practice.

I think a lot of times up here though, you are right, maybe it is because they want their party to do better and they want the economy to be in the tank for the elections. Maybe they have forgotten or lost touch with reality. But when you go home and talk to these people who lost their jobs and are fearing about losing their jobs, and you ask them, should we now do something or not do something to get this economy going, I think the answer is pretty clear that they want this economy moving despite what the politicians may say.

Mr. KINGSTON. The other things we are doing in order to help small businesses and we think it is very important to help small businesses because that is still 70 percent of the employment in this country, and, unfortunately, large businesses come and go. And it is a tremendous loss. We just lost a paper mill in St. Mary's, Georgia that I represent, 903 jobs. Those jobs are probably gone permanently. We hope something will happen to make that statement not the case, but unfortunately that is what it is looking like right now.

Small businesses, you can lose one or two of them and the economy still moves along. But depreciation, faster depreciation, increasing the bonus depreciation from 30 to 50 percent and extending it another few years, again so small businesses can make investments and write them off faster, and we believe that is going to be very healthy for small businesses. Also allowing them to have a 5-year net operating loss carry-back for 3 years, and that will help small businesses recover from some of the losses they have suffered under in this post-9/11 economy. And then, finally, increasing the expensing from 25 to \$100,000.

All of this is going to help your bicycle shop, your pet store, your clothes store, your tire store, all the small Main Street businesses back home. And we believe if you can help them you will do a lot for that NASCAR race fan.

I always say what we need to do is build tax policy around the NASCAR race fan. The mom and dad have a household income, one of them makes \$50,000 and the other makes about \$60,000, the household income anywhere from 75 to \$120,000. They have two and a half kids. They are the first in country, first in church, first in patriotism, first in paying their taxes, first in rolling up their sleeves, doing a fair job, and also do not ask for the government for this or that. They do not come to see you and me in Washington, D.C. They do not have an agenda. They do not come here to lobby for this loophole or for that expenditure. They are

just good folks in America. You can find them all around the country, from Miami to Savannah, from Maine to San Francisco.

□ 1645

They might not truly be a Nascar race fan, but if you go up there and stick and use that as your guide, you are going to take care of America; if you take care of that family, and by taking care of small business I believe we are taking a major step in that direction.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. The gentleman knows that in the State of Florida, I think it is probably similar to your State, small business is the economy of Florida. It is an incredible percentage, and yet when we try to help small business again by allowing those businesses to keep a little bit more of the money that they generate of their money, we are told that we are helping the rich. We are not helping the rich. We are helping the small business people in this country in the State of Florida that create the economy, that hire the people, that pay the wages, that provide the health care, that pay the taxes.

I wish that the opposition would do a couple things. First, that they would bring up a plan of their own, which they have not done. Number two is that they would talk and discuss the ideas as opposed to just throw out labels to see if they will stick that are just not based on fact because somebody should tell them that small business people in this country are not rich. They are struggling to earn a living. They are struggling to pay the rent. They are struggling to keep their employees and pay their employees and pay their insurance.

You better believe it that I am proud that this plan helps those businesses. It provides relief for those small businesses, but they do not want to talk about the issues and the specifics because they lose on that. So, therefore, they have to say it is irresponsible and reckless to provide tax relief to small businesses. It is not reckless, but they cannot talk about the specifics; therefore, they have to throw out words hoping that, like a big PR campaign, people will buy it and people will not look at the facts.

The problem is the American people are very wise.

Mr. KINGSTON. The Chair is an intelligent man and he has seen the Pelosi-Gephardt plan. There is not one. Has the gentleman seen one from the other body? There is not one. What do we have? Nine Democrats, I had not read the paper in a week, might be up to 10 or 12, nine Democrats are running for President of the United States; and I have not seen one of them introduce a plan, and I believe at least two of those candidates are Members of this body.

It is good that they are running for President because it gives more competition, and more competition is good

for the political process, like anything else; but while you are a Member of this body, should you not be introducing your own jobs tax relief plan, growth plan? We do not see it and you would think if there are any Democrats who are going to offer a plan, it would certainly be the ones who are running for President; but we have not seen it.

Another thing that is in this plan that I think will help the economy is what the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) calls a 515 plan and that is reducing the tax rate and the capital gains rate on dividends and capital gains: if you are in the 10 percent bracket, down to five; if you are in the 20 percent bracket, down to 15.

Again, I think it is real common sense that why would you reduce the capital gains tax. The idea is if I can sell something and keep more of the profit in my pocket, then I am more likely to sell it, and when I sell it and that dollar turns over, it stimulates the economy, and it is great for small business, great for the American middle-class taxpayer.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Also, we have to remember it is their money. It is not a gift. That is the thing that I keep hearing. I keep hearing it over and over again how government is going to give these people this capital gains reduction money. No, no, no.

All we are talking about is we are going to allow the people who own that money to be able to keep it, as opposed to send it to Washington so Washington can spend it on all sorts of things. No, we are going to allow the people to keep a little bit more of their money. It is not a gift. It is not government's money. It is their money.

We should not be apologetic to want to take less of the people's money, in particular when we see some of the waste and the fraud that goes on in Washington where we spend money on things that are frankly, for example, the debit cards that we have seen recently where people have used them to buy and to use them for personal issues, including some rather offensive things. We are talking about millions of dollars. And so we need to take more money from the people to do more of that? No, no. We need to make sure the people keep their money, as much of it as possible.

I for one think we should do a lot more of that and allow people to keep even more of their money because that stays in the economy. They use it to buy things, to save and provide more jobs. That is the way this country was built. That is the greatness of this country, and for anybody to say that that is reckless is hard for me to believe.

Mr. KINGSTON. It does get ridiculous. We are also doing something I think that is real important, and that is, we have passed H.R. 6, our energy bill. One of the things that small business people need and middle-class American tax payers need are lower en-

ergy prices, in the gasoline for their car and the heat and oil for their house and the electric bill for their air conditioner, whatever it is.

If we could get an abundant, inexpensive, clean energy supply, it will really help the economy, really help create jobs; and our energy package does lower our dependency on foreign Middle East gasoline and fossil fuel, which, of course, gets into national security and all other kinds of issues; but it also searches for alternatives like hydrogen fuel, fuel cell vehicles, and puts in lots of money for research so that we can get off fossil fuel and improve technology for smart buildings and energy-efficient houses and structures of all nature. That is going to help create jobs, and I am glad that we were able to pass that out of the House.

We need it passed by the other body, and we need to get it to the President for signature. The faster we do that, the less dependent we will be on fossil fuel, the more energy alternatives there will be.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. That is one of those issues that the other side continually criticizes and yet has no answers for. They always talk about how dependent we are on foreign oil, and there I think we all agree that we need to look at ways to be less dependent, which is why this bill is the right legislation at the right time. It has some provisions there that I think make so much sense.

It would allow us to be less dependent on foreign sources of oil and also of other energies. It is done in a responsible fashion, to protect the environment, which I think is something that is very, very important; and once again, it shows what you can do. You can come up with answers, reasonable answers that are good for the country that will also provide jobs, and that is again a big focus of this Republican majority is to provide jobs. Not only now, but particularly now; and if you look at the legislation that has come out of this body so far, including that one, there is a real strong common denominator.

Along with the other things that it does, that legislation would also provide jobs for the American people, high-paying jobs, by the way, for the American people; and, again, I just think we need to continue to emphasize that. I for one am not content at how the economy is going. I for one think that we need to do more, that we need to incentivize the economy. I think the American people agree with that, and clearly, the leadership in this House has said that, the President has said that; and there are a number of pieces of legislation that go way beyond talk.

These are results. These are things that we have passed that the committees have debated, that have been worked on for a long, long time; and so talk is cheap as they say, but in this case, in the energy bill, in the budget, in the jobs creation bill and so many others, it is not talk. It is results.

Mr. KINGSTON. Another way we are working in the House to help create jobs is with a good roads program, good infrastructure. Not everybody wants to live in the city, and yet we all have to kind of go to the city eventually. Maybe it is for a particular hospital operation, maybe just to buy something, maybe for entertainment, maybe for a job; but if you can have good roads that connect small towns to the large city, it is good for the economy in both places.

I represent the Port of Savannah and actually all of coastal Georgia, but I also have rural areas. I have 29 different counties in the first district that I have the honor of representing. One of the things I want to do and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS) wants to do is get a way so that the producer of Vidalia onions can get it overseas faster. Agriculture right now, so much of our market is a matter of overseas. I think this roads transportation program incentive for alternative uses like bicycles and electric cars, I think all that is going to help creates jobs, too.

In Atlanta right now there is a project called Atlantic Station. It is right here where I-85 and I-75 split in downtown Atlanta, and it was a brownfield. Then they went in there and reclaimed the land and cleaned up the polluted areas; and now they are building a regular community that will have some high-rise office buildings, some condominiums. It will have some retail places, a movie theater, parking underground; and the bridge that goes over I-75 and I-85 linking that to the traditional downtown part of Atlanta, more of the road is used for pedestrians and bicycles than it is actually for trucks and cars.

That is an example of something under our transportation bill that can happen all over the country. I hope that when you are visiting Georgia sometime you will have the time to see it because it is actually tomorrow's road for tomorrow's economy and tomorrow's community, and it is something exciting; but our TEA-21, which is our roads bill, again jobs, and it is going to be passed out of the House. So we are going to continue to do everything we can for small businesses.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Transportation is key for all of it, key for all of it. Matter of fact, you look at Florida and the rest of the country, but if you look at Florida, if you look at the three biggest industries, among them are agriculture, like it is in your State, commerce, and tourism. You cannot do any of those without a good infrastructure, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) is working awfully hard coming up with a package that I know we will all feel very proud of to make sure we have the infrastructure and, again, that also provides jobs. The building of those roads provides jobs and then everything that goes along with that.

Mr. KINGSTON. I know I can leave my house in Savannah, Georgia, basi-

cally take maybe two or three roads to get to I-95 and 10 hours later I am going to be in Miami, Florida; and if I go north on it, 10 hours later or depends on how fast you drive, of course, but I can be north of Washington, D.C., almost in New York City, can go up to Maine.

Interstate highways started as national defense, moving our military for safety, lots of ideas, but behind the interstate highway system for national security, under President Eisenhower; but today, they have also been a huge boon to rural economies. Anywhere that there was an exit ramp, there is now a truck stop, a gas station, a convenience store, a fast food store, a retail outlet; and interstates have created tons of jobs in the United States of America.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. It is amazing how almost every job out there, whether we know it or not, is dependent on that transportation infrastructure. Without that we would not be able to get products in and out, people in and out, nothing. It is totally dependent.

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to say this: on I-95 in coastal Georgia, we have something like 55,000 cars a day that go down, and all that we are asking them is to stop and leave a little bit of their money in Georgia before they go to Florida and spend all of it.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. We thought it was the other way around, but there are obviously major infrastructure problems, and we clearly need to emphasize the roads; and I know that this Congress will be doing that, and the gentleman from Alaska's (Mr. YOUNG) committee, that I have the privilege to serve on, is going to be working on that. There are areas, whether it is Miami or Collier County where you have I-75 as well, that needs a lot of help; and I am optimistic that we will be able to do that for the economy's sake, for jobs' sake, and also to be able to get goods and people in and out.

I have an unrelated question, and I do not know if this is the right time to ask it. One of the things that has struck me in all the debates out there, and I frankly admit it caught me a little bit by surprise is when you see the increases that our budget has put for Medicare, for example, and Medicaid and also Medicare would drop, and on top of that we are doing the drug prescription plan, and yet I keep hearing the other side saying that we are actually cutting those programs, which is just factually incorrect.

I have to admit to you that I have never seen a place where everywhere except for government where huge increases, certain people say are cuts, and I just want to make it very clear that we have not cut. Not only have we not cut all those things that we keep hearing about, we have increased funding for all those things; and yet I keep hearing the Democrats saying that we are cutting.

□ 1700

The Democrats keep saying we are going to do all of these horrible things; we are cutting these funds. That is not what we passed. That is not what has been on the table.

Is that something that is usual here? Do the Democrats always just make up the facts? Is their attitude do not let the facts confuse the issue?

Mr. KINGSTON. Absolutely. I have been here 10 years; and according to the liberal, big-government types in Washington, anything they are not happy with they call a cut. There are, frankly, excesses in the Federal Government system that should be cut. But it does not matter what it is; everybody who is against something, that is a cut. That is a cut. Yet veteran spending has increased. Education spending has increased. Medicare has increased. Our prescription drug plan, which will help seniors get affordable prescription drugs, and it should not be partisan, Americans should not have to choose between food and medicine, and we all have parents and grandparents who need these drugs, and we all hopefully will be seniors ourselves, we do not need partisan rhetoric. We need responsible legislation.

To answer the gentleman's question, it is the standard around here. Every time somebody does not like something, it is a cut. It is a tax break for the wealthy, or it is going to kill the environment. Or that the seniors and the children are going to go starving. One gets used to it and kind of moves on.

I wanted to mention to the gentleman that one of the other things that we are doing, not just Medicare, we are trying to come up with an affordable and accessible health care. That is very, very important for small businesses in America. Small businesses in America now have a huge burden when they try to provide health care for their employees. Yet when you are in the job market, you have to look not just at the salary but at the benefit packages. By making health care more affordable and more accessible, that is another way we in Congress are going to help create jobs.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I worry if we do not do that a lot of people depend on their jobs to provide health care. If it gets to where it is not affordable to employers, they are not going to provide that benefit.

Just like it took this leadership to finally forget about all of the rhetoric, it took the Republican leadership to finally pass a Medicare prescription drug plan. And with all due respect, the Democrats were here for 40 years. They always talked about it and never did it. I can understand it falling through the cracks 1 or 2 years, but they never did it. It took the Republicans to do the prescription drug plan under Medicare. I was hoping that those that legitimately wanted to do it for 40 years, would have said, wow, it is about time, as opposed to criticizing it.

I am confident it will have to be, once again, the Republican leadership, the Republican Congress that is going to have to lead to make sure we have health care that is accessible, affordable, that is quality health care for Americans. I do not know of a more important issue for American families and American small businesses, and, frankly, for even some of the larger businesses as well than to provide good quality, affordable health care. But there again, the Republican Party is going to show the leadership that it has shown on every single issue from welfare reform to Medicare prescription drug benefits, and health care is one of the issues that the Republican Party is showing that it can tackle with results.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is too bad that there needs to be popularity in the polls to get elected. But this is not about popularity, and leadership is not a popularity contest. Sometimes you have to make difficult decisions, and there is not going to be 100 percent approval ratings on every package. Part of leadership is to move the agenda forward.

I know that the gentleman has spent a lot of time in support of the judicial nomination of Mr. Estrada, and the gentleman has expressed a lot of disappointment that the other body has not moved. We create and protect jobs by law and order. If people know that there is lower crime because there is justice when you are brought in front of a judge and there are good judges, we will reduce crime in communities back home. Here we have Washington, D.C., a very high crime rate area, they have a judicial opening, a vacancy; and yet we have liberals in Washington, D.C. who will not let Mr. Estrada get on the bench, and yet he is highly qualified. He went to Columbia and Harvard. He actually had the same qualifications of a judge who has been supported by the Democrat Party, the only difference he is Hispanic. For some reason that is a big issue. Some liberals in Washington cannot stand the fact that President Bush would have a great Hispanic nomination. What is happening with that right now?

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. It is even worse than the gentleman states. It is not only that they do not want to vote for him, they do not want a vote to take place; and they are doing all of these parliamentary procedures to avoid taking a vote on Mr. Estrada. It has been a very interesting ride we have been watching. Every excuse in the book has been used against this gentleman, and they are just excuses because they are not based on facts.

As we are speaking, there is kind of a pattern emerging. For some reason, they do not want to discuss the facts; and, therefore, they throw out other things. One of the reasons that they said Mr. Estrada should not be a judge on this court in D.C. is he is not quali-

fied enough because he had never been a judge before. I would not have a problem if that is the standard. It just happens to be on that same court those same people that are saying that about Mr. Estrada supported other judges that were never judges before that now sit on that court. If it is okay for them not to have had previous judicial experience to sit on that bench, why is it not all right for Mr. Estrada? What is the real reason?

They say there are certain memoranda that he has. That is the criteria. If the Department of Justice does not show us certain memoranda that were internal memoranda that were written, that would disqualify him. If that is the standard, I do not have a problem; except there are seven judges currently that have come out of that same office where Mr. Estrada was and those documents were never requested. That is clearly not the reason. If that was the reason, the other judges would not have been able to move forward.

There is a real weird double standard with Mr. Estrada, and it is so much so they do not even want it to come up for a vote on the floor. I do not have a problem with objecting to somebody. I do not have a problem with disagreeing with somebody. Thank God we can do that here in a free Democratic society. But they do not want to discuss it or debate it. They do not want to vote on it. I do not know what their agenda is.

I know that the reasons that they give are not the real reasons, and that is a sad statement. It is also particularly sad because Mr. Estrada is a man who got here at age 17. He studied and worked. He did very well for himself. He went to Columbia and then Harvard Law School and graduated magna cum laude. He worked as a clerk for a U.S. Supreme Court Justice. He worked as a prosecutor in the State of New York. He worked in the Department of Justice under two Presidents, one Republican and one Democrat; and all of those people that he worked for him said this man is a man of integrity and would be a great judge. Yet the Democratic leadership does not want him to even have a vote. That is difficult to believe.

Mr. KINGSTON. Here we are, we have just come through a war, we have jobs that we need to create. We have an economy that we need to turnaround, and yet there are Members apparently of the other body who are content to make one of the most highly qualified judicial nominees a big issue. It is such a double standard. If he had not been Hispanic, in your opinion, would he have been approved by now?

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I can tell the gentleman without any doubt that the reasons that they are going to block even the possibility of him having a vote on the floor of the other body to the point of using parliamentary procedures that have not been used for a candidate of that court before, I can tell the gentleman the reasons they are giving are not the real

reasons because we have gone through them and analyzed them. We have talked about them here on the floor of this Chamber, and the bottom line is those are not the real reasons. If those are not the real reasons, then what is the real reason?

It is very sad that a person like Mr. Estrada, who has worked so hard and studied so hard and who has lived his little part of the American dream, has done what this society has asked him to do and much more, has been an example to so many, that his case is not even being allowed to be debated on the floor and is not allowed to have a vote. The reasons given are not the real reasons.

It is a sad day for the country. He is 41 years old. He had argued 15 cases in front of the Supreme Court of the United States before he was 40. Think about that. It is a shame not to have somebody of that quality on the court. It is also a shame for those of us who believe in diversity, who believe that one should be judged by your qualifications and not by your race.

I say that because people have used race publicly. They have said that one of the reasons that he should not be on there is because of his race, and that to me is highly offensive. You should not get a position because of your race, and you should not be denied a position that you are qualified for because of your race. Yet those are the reasons that they have given. They have given others, by the way as well, but those have proven to be false. The only one that still remains out there is when they have said that Mr. Estrada should not be on that court because of his race.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is very disappointing, but I hope that the President can work with them and see if he can get something done. The other thing is the President was elected, and let him get his team in place. It should be that simple.

I just wanted to cover these topics and wanted to ask the gentleman if he had some other topics that he wanted to conclude with.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to state one more time that every day that goes by, we have to remember there are thousands of men and women in uniform that heroically defend our freedoms, and they do so without asking for anything. They do not get paid a lot of money. They are not there for the publicity.

Every day our freedoms are being protected by men and women in uniform who are heroes every single day. Sometimes they are asked to put their lives on the line to protect our freedoms and to even sometimes within that scope of protecting us, to protect and liberate other people. They have been doing it for generations. They continue doing it today.

Right now as the Iraqi theater is looking good and the Iraqi people are free and they are celebrating their

freedom, we have to remember today there are men and women who are in harm's way. We cannot forget that for one single moment, and we have to be grateful and thankful that there are people like them who are willing to do one of the greatest sacrifices one can ever do to protect our freedoms, and we can never thank them enough.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I know for the 34 constituents that I lost in Iraq, and I believe the six to 12 in Afghanistan, I am certainly not going to forget them; and I am going to do everything I can to help promote Iraqi democracy and also jobs in America. We have got a good bill on jobs this week. I am looking forward to voting on it and supporting it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Members are reminded to refrain from improper references to the Senate.

□ 1715

DEMOCRATS EXAMINE WAYS AND MEANS TAX PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I came here to talk about the proposed tax cuts, but as I sat here on the floor and listened to my colleagues, I would be remiss if I did not respond to a couple of issues that they raised. One of them was that they accused the Democratic Party of wanting the economy to stay in the dumps just so that we could be successful. I dare either of the gentlemen that just finished speaking to find any member of the Democratic Party that would want this economy to stay in the dumps just so we can be successful. But the Democratic Party is going to be successful on the issues and that is what I want to talk about.

Let me do one more thing, though. One of the things that was discussed, and this is called misrepresentation. One of my colleagues who spoke before me said that the Democrats were holding up the appointment of Justice Estrada at a time when justice needed to be dispensed in the District of Columbia and at a time when law and order was out of place and that he could be there trying cases. I just want to remind my colleague that Justice Estrada was being considered for an appellate court, not a trial level court and that justices on the appellate court do not do trial of fact. So that is again a misrepresentation that people make when they are trying to make one party different than the other. But I am not going to spend my time today in response to some of those things. I would just suggest that everyone needs

to pay attention and listen to the real words that people are saying.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns about the Chair of the Committee on Ways and Means' plan that was unveiled this week, marked up in a lively session of the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday and will be considered on this floor shortly. In my own city, the City of Cleveland, 53,900 people have lost their jobs since this President took office. That is 4.7 percent of the workforce. In my State, the State of Ohio, 167,000 people have lost their jobs since this President took office. That is 3 percent of the workforce. The Committee on Ways and Means considered over the past couple of days the plan of Chairman THOMAS. Unlike the Democratic stimulus plan that will be fast acting, fair and fiscally responsible, let me say those three Fs again, fast acting, fair and fiscally responsible, the Republican plan is another in a series of GOP tax plans that is economically irresponsible, narrowly tailored to benefit the wealthiest percentage of the population, and will not provide the immediate stimulus our economy needs in the form of job creation and productivity growth.

The chairman's bill has been referred to as a compromise to the President's so-called economic stimulus plan, perhaps with the hopes that Democrats would respond favorably to any compromise to the President's fiscally reckless plan. While Chairman THOMAS' bill does indeed have a different approach to some of the proposals offered by the President, the end result is still the same. It is poorly timed, shortsighted and narrowly designed to benefit only a small percentage of the population.

This compromise reminds me of an old witticism: You can hang a sign on a pig saying that it is a horse but it is still a pig. The gentleman from California has hung a sign on a bad economic policy and proclaimed it to be a fix that our economy needs. But just like the pig with the sign around its neck proclaiming it to be a horse, this plan has problems.

Let me talk about just a few of them. The treatment of dividends and capital gains. The GOP plan is not fair. The President's proposal for exempting dividends from being taxed was the centerpiece of his economic stimulus plan. While the Thomas bill does not contain that proposal and I believe it does not contain that proposal because in committee meeting after committee meeting, I kept saying to members of the committee and witnesses before the committee, do you understand the impact that the dividend tax cut will have on low-income housing credits? Do you understand the impact that a dividend tax cut will have, in fact, on annuity programs? And I think he finally got it. While the Thomas bill does not contain the same dividend tax cut proposal that was presented by the President, it revolves around reducing

the tax on capital gains and dividends as the cornerstone to sound economic policy.

Under current tax laws, capital gains are taxed at 20 percent. Dividends are treated and taxed as income at the applicable tax rate. The Thomas plan will lower the capital gains tax rate to 15 percent and also provides that all dividends be taxed at the same rate. Unlike the President's plan, the Thomas plan provides dividend tax relief regardless of how much Federal income tax is paid by a corporation. In this regard, the Thomas plan does not have as great an adverse impact on low-income housing tax credits and other corporate tax benefits that would have resulted under the President's plan. But this is the least egregious aspect of the plan and it is overshadowed by so many more unwise proposals.

The chairman's dividend capital gains proposal will cost approximately \$300 billion of the total \$500 billion cost of the plan. He boasts that this is less than the nearly \$400 billion cost of the President's dividend proposal. But he is relying on accounting gimmicks and unrealistic expiration dates. Many of the aspects of his plan are set to expire in 2006. But will these provisions really be allowed to expire? Most likely not. The more realistic outcome is that they will become a part of the ever-increasing number of tax provisions that are extended every few years. A more realistic estimate of the Thomas plan's economic impact on the Treasury must assume that its provisions will be extended beyond 2005. Under this realistic assumption, the \$550 billion cost of the Thomas plan not only exceeds the \$726 billion cost of the Bush plan but suddenly results in a total cost of about \$1 trillion through 2013, as indicated in the chart that I am about to show my colleagues.

This chart breaks down certain elements of the Thomas plan as compared to the Bush plan and concludes with the result of the Thomas plan being even more expensive than the Bush plan. For example, under the Bush plan, the dividend and capital gains tax cut would have been \$396 billion. Under the Thomas plan, \$296 billion of the tax cuts do not expire. However, the top bracket rate reductions effective only for 2003 will be the same and the child tax credit increases will be the same. But here is where we have to take a look and go further. Under the Thomas plan, we widen the 10 percent bracket effective 2003. It is \$45 billion. Under the Thomas package, it is \$18 billion. But if the tax cuts do not expire, it will go back up to \$45 billion as proposed in the President's plan.

Tax breaks for married couples. Under the Thomas proposal, it expires in 2005. The impact under the Bush proposal is \$55 billion. The Thomas, \$45 billion. But if this 2005 date is extended, the tax break for married couples will cost us \$55 billion.

Again, let us take a look at the business expensing. Proposed to expire in